Incessant Incarnation as the Future of Humanity: The Promise of Schillebeeckx's Sacramental Theology

STEPHAN VAN ERP

Introduction

Edward Schillebeeckx is without a doubt one of the most important figures of the generation of *aggiornamento* theologians who have reflected on theology's new role in Church and Western society in the second half of the twentieth century. With considerable knowledge of the history of theology and the philosophy of his age, he has thoroughly tackled the two main tasks that arose from the new challenges modern theology was facing at the time: *ressourcement* and *renewal*.[1] Schillebeeckx has been involved with most of the work that needed to be done in Catholic theology: debating the various versions of Thomism, understanding the developments of secularization, reflecting on the importance of existential phenomenology for theology, rethinking the Church's place in modern culture, and exploring the historical contexts, worldviews, and experiences that have shaped the Gospels, to name but a few.[2]

Despite the high expectations and promises of this 'new theology' before and after the Second Vatican Council, the re-positioning of theology has been a laborious and polarizing undertaking. Schillebeeckx did not allow himself to be discouraged by this and unremittingly engaged in the renewal of theological content. To him, this was not a correlative strategy of making traditional theology accessible for new generations in new situations. As he saw it, theological renewal was and always will be a necessary response to the ongoing presence of Christ among us, the ever-anew sacramental encounter with God. This means in my view that the *incarnation* should be regarded as the starting

point of his theology and its sacramental character as the key motivation of his theological hermeneutics. According to Schillebeeckx, being receptive to the signs of the time primarily meant experiencing God's salvific presence in the world.

In this closing thematic article of this issue of *Concilium*, I should like to explore the future of Edward Schillebeeckx's theology. Since the period in which he developed his theology, theology's tasks seem to have multiplied. Conversations about faith and science, faith and authority, faith and globalization, and intercultural and inter-religious dialogue have intensified. In this diversified landscape of contemporary theology, Schillebeeckx's insights on the incarnation and the sacraments will continue to provide fertile ground for current debates on the God-human relationship in Church and society.[3] Not ethos (Küng), not liberation (Gutiérrez), not the transcendental (Rahner), not glory (von Balthasar), but the *sacramental* will prove to be the key for understanding the relationship between God and people, and the role of the Church in the world as a community that embodies that relationship. In what follows, I shall present a sketch of this theology of the sacramental encounter in the wake of Schillebeeckx's thought. First, I shall describe the sacramental encounter as a foundation of theological hermeneutics. Then, I shall focus on the Christological and ecclesiological implications of the sacramental encounter for our understanding of the human and the secular. Finally, I shall outline the promise of Schillebeeckx's theology.

I History as ongoing revelation: the hermeneutics of incarnation

Although Schillebeeckx's hermeneutics has been influential in Catholic theology up to the present day, it is not the incarnational starting point of his theology that has been taken up by others, nor have its Christological implications. Both Schillebeeckx scholars and critics mention his anthropology and historical criticism, and in particular the contrasting experience of human suffering and the political theology based on it, as the main characteristics of his legacy. But this is, to say the least, a reduction of his thought. Schillebeeckx himself might be partly to blame for this. If we take his contextual (rather than correlational) hermeneutics seriously, we have to recognize that, since the discovery of context and practices of faith as theological sources,

theology has constantly needed to reassess its content and stance regarding the time in which it takes place.[4] The expected, but incorrect, conclusion would be that any theology that went before becomes superseded as soon as a new theology is introduced. Is this the tragic consequence of all hermeneutic theology – that theology becomes outdated in accordance with its own principles of perspectivity and contextuality, as soon as the culture that produced it has become a thing of the past? In other words: does the hermeneutics of re-contextualization imply the end of tradition as a productive force?

Schillebeeckx solved this problem by pointing out the double meaning of history, which according to him should result in a double focus for modern theology: On the one hand, modern faith-experiences seem to indicate new theological modes of thought that need articulation and clarification. On the other, a transforming faith forces us to reflect on the renewal that old theological achievements will need to undergo as a result of new influences. This gives modern theology its double focus: both on the past *and* on the future. Schillebeeckx repeatedly emphasized that the truth of past theology will not be lost as a result of the dynamics of a transforming faith, but instead will help to purify and to differentiate, and even, at times, to correct as well. Since the middle of the twentieth century, there has been a growing understanding of the task of systematic theology as explicitly and fundamentally determined by historicity: both in safeguarding old theological truths and in reflecting on the experiences of the historically new as it is immersed in the present and in the future.[5]

What appeared to be a new and promising discovery to Schillebeeckx – allowing the content of theology to be co-determined by contemporary religious experiences and practices – may seem self-evident to the current generation of theologians. Nevertheless, this modern realization maintains its urgency, not only because the diversity of contexts should be taken into account as *loci* where faith comes to the fore, but because there are good theological reasons for taking the present into account as the realm in which the incarnation takes place. However, these current times have become much more difficult to interpret by means of a theological scheme than any before them. Not least, because there seems to be a virtually unbridgeable chasm with the past. This impression of estrangement from theological interpretations in the past may be strengthened by the fact that contemporary theologians feel

obliged to bridge that chasm themselves. There is a tendency to consider theology a purely constructive enterprise, instead of believing in the continuity of salvation history, which itself should also be considered as a dynamic that informs and transforms theology. To ignore this might intensify the polarization of contemporary theology in two existing camps that make the same mistake of viewing theology as being purely constructive: a traditionalist one that seeks to safeguard old insights, and a revisionist one that is mainly interested in the content of faith within our modern age.[6]

Schillebeeckx's commitment, from the early stages of his theological development, to considering the interweaving of present and past as the main task of a theological hermeneutics with a view to the future, seems to have become a rare thing in academic theology. In contemporary theology, the hermeneutical problem of the continuity of tradition – i. e. the continuity of revelation – has been dealt with too formally. Contextualization or restoration have become the hermeneutical tools for understanding and confirming our bond with the historical Christ-event, leading to radical particularity on the one hand or new forms of anti-modernism on the other. What is needed, however, is a language for and understanding of that which calls us to contextualize or restore Christian faith. Theological hermeneutics needs to articulate that which commands us to engage with the present as the realm in which God is present with us. To avoid a repetition of previous polarizing theological positions, a reconsideration of the concept of incarnation as the material motivation of theological hermeneutics is called for. What connects the present with the context in which the gospel took shape?[7] How can the promise of God's future be heard in our time? Further study of Schillebeeckx's hermeneutics could articulate this as the ongoing human story of God with his people: God incarnate in our time as the promise and future of humanity.

Some of the next generation of Schillebeeckx scholars are now pointing to the incarnation as a universalizing hermeneutical tool. Robert Schreiter has searched for a new concept of the fullness of faith, embodied in a variety of religious identities.[8] In his radical hermeneutics of tradition, Lieven Boeve has introduced the concept of 'interruption', which, on the one hand, describes God's actions in this world, particularly in a day and age in which the Christian story is no longer taken for granted. On the other hand, this divine interruption of history

calls upon people to interrupt the world themselves, which safeguards a full acknowledgment of particular religious, Christian and non-Christian traditions in contemporary society.[9]

Perhaps the best example of the incarnational hermeneutics that could be developed further after Schillebeeckxis the theology of Erik Borgman. In the Editorial to this issue of *Concilium*, he writes that Schillebeeckx 'did not aim at applying or translating the tradition to the present, he wanted to read the present theologically, as a time and a place of God's presence'. Borgman calls his own project a 'theology of culture.' He claims to have derived its statute from Schillebeeckx's early theology, the theology of Marie-Dominique Chenu, and ultimately, that of Thomas Aquinas. What is at stake in this 'theology of culture' is a religious interpretation of contemporary culture, assuming that everything that exists is part of God's creation, and as such, part of the history of salvation. This theology does not regard tradition and the community of the Church as a given that requires interpretation, but as living forms of community that are constantly renewed by God's presence in the world, and as such provide the dynamic, ever-changing subject of theology.[10]

II Christ as sacrament: anthropology is Christology

Does Schillebeeckx's theology suffer from an anthropological reduction? His critics argue that he went too far in founding faith and the tradition of the Church on human experience, and that as a consequence of this, God no longer plays a sovereign role. His emphasis on human experience is indeed the result of a fundamental philosophical consideration argued by modern epistemology and metaphysics and the theological recognition of the social-cultural and historical-political constellation as a main source of reflection. In his earlier works, however, Schillebeeckx always reserves pride of placing for the concept of revelation, and in his later works he increasingly qualifies this term with the concept of salvation. Revelation and salvation, like history, the *humanum* and experience, are central concepts in his theology. The last three have to some extent played a leading role, because – particularly at the Second Vatican council – they were presented to the Church and world of his time as a challenge and as an instruction to modern society. Revelation and experience were not regarded as being hierarchical, as

each other's extension, but rather as a symbol of each other, connected and intertwined, but not reducible to each other. The council, and later also Schillebeeckx himself, have without a doubt theologically raised the status of the history of human experience, but always from the perspective of the human as the concrete history of God's salvation – a primarily theological notion, therefore, which Schillebeeckx would go on to provide with a solid but historically dynamic foundation that is inextricably both Christological and anthropological.

Furthermore, one of the most important insights Schillebeeckx obtained from the phenomenology of his time was the anthropocentric notion that human consciousness is a consciousness that has been incarnated in the world and in the body: 'it enters the world by means of the act in which it constitutes itself, in which it presents itself to this part of worldly reality that is our own biological-sensitive physicality'. He used a non-dualistic, constructive concept of the human person's self-realization in the world, outlining the – as he saw them – 'revolutionary' consequences for modern systematic theology, particularly for Christology, for Mariology, for the doctrine of grace, for ecclesiology and for eschatology. He believed that the various and different dogmatic tracts have undergone a radical change as a result of new ideas about the personhood of God and man, the sacramental relationship between them, as well as new ideas about the human experience of the relationship between God and man.

This 'anthropologization' has led to many misunderstandings and debates, as Andrés Torres Queiruga too has discussed in his article in this issue. The main misunderstanding, which has also attached itself to Schillebeeckx's own theology, is that theology now supposedly gains an anthropological foundation and will therefore entirely explain and constitute faith on the basis of human experience, as a consequence of which even theological concepts like revelation and grace are no longer considered the result of divine action, but subjective projections, devoid from any measure of reality. This is an incorrect inference, at least where Schillebeeckx's own theology is involved. According to him, the prime *locus theologicus* is the personal human history of the historical Christ. He believes that the incarnational pivot of the history of salvation must therefore be the precondition of faith and theology.

Experiencing the history of salvation is not just a human project, as it is the result of revelation and grace: God relating to us. This idea of

relational salvation involves human persons in such a way that they can freely realize themselves within it. So, even in an anthropologically inspired theology like Schillebeeckx's, the primacy lies with divine revelation in history, even though this is always mediated by human experience. In the 1960s and 1970s, the anthropological focus of modern theology went hand in hand with a growing interest in Christology. Human experience and practices in which the humane comes to the fore were regarded as new events to reconsider the person and work of Jesus Christ. As Johnson Siluvaipillai has stipulated in his article in this issue, the anthropological interest in theology did not therefore result in a moving away from the divinity of Jesus Christ, as far as the theology of Schillebeeckx is concerned. Instead, it pointed to the dynamic and ever-new presence of the history of salvation that has been revealed in the life and work of Jesus the Christ.

According to Schillebeeckx, the first and most fundamental question about human living is that of the mystery of faith, the revelation of the salvific reality of Christ in history, with which we are confronted personally through the light of faith. Through our experiences, we get entrance to that mystery. So the experience of salvation in history tells us the story of Jesus Christ as the Son of God and the Son of man. In short, by drawing the theological connection of human experiences and the history of salvation, Schillebeeckx has not so much articulated that Christology is anthropology – however true that may be – but that the key to true anthropology is Christology.

III The world as sacrament: ecclesiological challenges

Schillebeeckx based the close interconnection between Christology and anthropology on a sacramental view of human history and the present. In the Editorial to this issue, Erik Borgman suggests that Schillebeeckx' theology implied that human history is a sacramental place. The specific sacraments of the Church are sign and instrument of God's presence in the world, and as such, Borgman writes, they make the whole of human history visible as a sacrament of salvation. If it is true, as he suggests, that Schillebeeckx implied that the presence of God's salvation is not limited to the concrete history of Jesus of Nazareth but encompasses the whole of human history up to the present, then further research is needed into ways of viewing the world as a sacramental place. If

sacraments are signs and instruments that call for the witnessing and practice of faith, how then do the world and the people that live in it become an instrument of salvation? If the main characteristic of a sacrament is the God-human encounter, how can we discern that encounter in the present? And if such an encounter can be perceived in the here and now, what then is the connection with God's salvific work in Jesus Christ? From a very early stage in his work, Schillebeeckx struggled with these questions.

As early as the 1950s, after his dissertation on the sacramental economy of salvation in the thought of Thomas Aquinas, he further developed his theory of the sacraments in *Christ the Sacrament of the Encounter with God*.[11] In that book's penultimate chapter, on the subject of the Christian life, he tries to connect sacramental and extra-sacramental grace, concluding with a section called 'Everything is grace made visible'. What were his reasons for thinking beyond the sacraments of the Church? Why did he not limit the incarnational presence of God to the historical Christ-event and the mediation of that salvific presence to the visible Church and its sacraments? The answer to that question is partly to warrant the sovereignty of God's Spirit in the world and partly to do justice to present human experiences of the sacramental encounter with God.

Schillebeeckx does not question the significance of Christ as the primordial sacrament, or that of the necessary function of the sacraments of the Church, but he does seek to extend sacrament to the whole of Christian life. In her article, Jennifer Cooper is right to suggest that he identifies a direct connection between Christ and the Eucharist, in as far as Christ himself is given in the Eucharist, instead of it being a gift that refers to him. However, that direct connection does not exclude different forms of mediation. Schillebeeckx writes that although there are only seven sacraments, there are numerous forms of sacramental expression within the life of the Church. It would be wrong to identify the life of the Church with the life that is confined within the bounds of the priesthood and the official sacraments, he argues. It is not exclusively from the sacraments that we derive grace. By this, he did not conclude the opposite, as if the Church and its sacraments were but one, non-necessary form. Merely to concentrate on the invisibility of the Church, rather than also acknowledge that the Church is necessary to make grace visible, would equally be wrong:

> Again and again men have fallen into the heresy of regarding the Church as merely the invisible communion of those who truly live in the union of grace with Christ. They deny the Church its incarnation. They take away not only its weakness and sinfulness but also the visibility of its grace, which means they take away grace itself.[12]

The sacraments however, Schillebeeckx claims, do not primarily proceed from the visible Church alone. They also arise from the 'inward communion of the faithful in grace with Christ our Lord'. In my opinion, Schillebeeckx defies criticism for constructing a social-theoretical ecclesiology, such as Paul Murray's in this issue, precisely because he places grace at the centre of his view of the Church. Moreover, he offers much more than an idealized alternative for the existing Church, as Murray also seems to suggest. Schillebeeckx seeks to balance between an idealized and the existing Church, by calling both the actual sacraments of the visible Church and the sacramental life of the faithful 'ecclesial'. The Church is necessary as the visible reality of faith in everyday life, but as such it represents a holiness that is much wider than the visible Church alone. Murray is right to note that Schillebeeckx does not offer specific strategies for the present challenges of the Church. But he does offer the tools to discern an ecclesial holiness that is also invisibly present in the world, in human weakness and suffering. This invisible presence is a call to the Church to make it visible. For the Church itself, hearing this call results in an openness to ever and anew become Church. This is why Schillebeeckx might have wanted to identify the world as a sacrament: not just because it is the place of deified creaturehood, but because it is also where the ongoing encounter with God takes place in human experiences and human living. Incarnation is not only the event of the gift of God in Christ and the new creation, but also of the incessant giving of God in every individual's life in the here and now.

There is an ambiguity here in Schillebeeckx's theological position on the world being a sacrament and the consequence of the – instrumental – role of the believer. Does that role, as a response to the deification by grace in creation, consist primarily of being sacramentally aware of grace, or of being actively and ethically involved in making visible that the world is given by God's grace? It remains a matter of speculation

whether Schillebeeckx, had he further developed his sacramental theology in new directions, would have articulated the role of Christian ethics as a way of understanding sacramental living, as Ben Kautzer has suggested in his article in this issue. In my opinion, Schillebeeckx' sacramental theology need not be pursued in the direction of explicating Christian action. Instead, it needs to focus on the mystical quality of the sacraments by understanding the human *submission* to the world, being the place of God's salvific presence.

To answer the questions that arise from Schillebeeckx's attempts to extend the sacraments to Christian living and the world, one does not need to confirm that submission to Christ could lead to a virtuous engagement with the world. Conversely, one needs to understand how our being in the world is itself a submission to Christ. In the awareness of the world as a sacramental place emerges the encounter with Christ, the primordial sacrament. This encounter with Christ shapes Christian living, which finds its source in our contrasting experiences of human weakness and suffering. Experiencing and contemplating the history of Christ for us is the key for considering the world the place of ongoing creation and incarnation. In that way, it manifests itself as the visible sign and instrument that offers the Church, and the faithful people who shape it, the opportunity to be captured by God's salvific work. Schillebeeckx writes that

> besides these moments which are decisive objectively, in the life of a religious person, there can be others which are of vital importance subjectively. These extra-sacramental bestowals of grace can in fact raise the Christian to greater heights than the grace received in the sacraments themselves. The sacraments are necessary markers, milestones on the way, so that by living the Christian life as a whole we may become more and more one with Christ.[13]

IV Understanding incarnation: theology after Schillebeeckx

The extent of Schillebeeckx's influence on theology is not undisputed. Some regard his thought as a necessary transformation for the twentieth century, which is now not needed any more. They consider him to be an adherent of the liberal theology that is now supposed to have failed: too partial to the historical-critical method and too concerned with the

adaptation of Christian faith to the spirit of the times. In contemporary theology, this is the dominant view of Edward Schillebeeckx: a liberal, modern theologian who, open to human experience and cultural context, has adapted theology to the modern age; someone who paid more attention to the history of man than to the eternity of God; a theologian of practice, rather than of theory.

After Schillebeeckx, those polarizing filters based on criteria such as the importance of experience, practice, and history have split theology into different schools and movements. This compartmentalization has also had consequences for the positioning of individual theologians. Schillebeeckx was deemed to belong to the liberal wing, which meant that his work would be received by either a liberal sympathizer or a critical opponent. It meant that, in the era after the criticism of ideology, theology became more and more ideological. Theology after Schillebeeckx became politicized to such an extent that prior to expressing a theological opinion, a fundamental theological self-identification was required. The main question was whether or not one was an orthodox or a liberal, a foundational or a post-foundational, an analytic or a hermeneutic, a historical critic or a diachronic one, a scholarly or an ecclesiastical, a traditional or a modern, etcetera. Such an imposition of one's position leads to an unfortunate reductionism when applied to a theologian such as Schillebeeckx, because such categorizations of his theology do not do justice to his work.

Many theologians are indebted to the historical, anthropological, and critical methods of thinkers like Schillebeeckx, but only few current theologians realize that these methods had a theological, incarnational foundation, as I have shown in this article. The result is a theology after Schillebeeckx that tries to relate to contemporary culture, just as he himself once did. A new generation of theologians tries to find 'the theological' in culture, without actually knowing what to look for and where to look for it. This leads some to conclude that the theological voice is absent in modern culture, and not without reason. Others do see crude analogies of faith in modern cultural expressions and life styles, but they base those analogies on language and on phenomena, instead of on a theological theory of revelation in history, as Schillebeeckx did. When we want to discern the visibility of grace in our present time, we need to look beyond these phenomena and analogies and see the incarnational presence of God in

the language and phenomena of today. Schillebeeckx's views of ongoing salvation in history and the world as a sacrament of the encounter with God will prove to be fruitful ideas to pursue if we are to understand this.

How do we continue to build on the work of Schillebeeckx, who focussed his theology on the incarnation and the sacramental encounter with God that people experience in contemporary culture? He has left us a theological heritage that is very rich with materials and reflections, a heritage that urgently requires further investigation. Meanwhile, there have been over 80 doctoral theses on his work, and it seems likely that more are yet to follow. An eleven-volume collection of his works in English will soon be published, and it is likely that this will generate further research as well.[14] That future research partly concerns his own theology: What exactly was his role and importance during and after the Second Vatican Council? In what way did Edward Schillebeeckx's lectures and articles influence the documents of the Council? In what way did his interpretation of those council documents influence his later theological hermeneutics and ecclesiology? What is the importance of his sacramental view of Church and world, and of ministry?

But his work could also play an integral part in future theological research concerning current issues in Church and society: What is the meaning of his theology of the universality of Christ in a religiously pluralistic culture? Has his emphasis on historicity, spirituality, and experiences of suffering changed the study of religion and of faith? How does his form of orthodoxy, orthopraxis, in his words 'the sought-after *humanum*, promised to us in Christ, which has to be performed', relate to the current re-emergence of fundamentalism and neo-orthodoxy in theology and in religion?

Schillebeeckx has allowed his theological agenda to be determined by the present. In keeping with the spirit of the Council, he considered the present to be the time and the place in which God's creation is continued, in which scripture and tradition are continued in new forms and in a new language, and in which the relationship between God and humanity gains a future. According to Schillebeeckx, this present is the key motive of modern theology. In the present, the Word of God can be heard in creation, scripture, and the living language of tradition and faith. Following the directions he has given us, the future of theology should not primarily be concerned with how to reform the Church or the

liturgy, or how to live the Christian life. First and foremost, it needs to see and think the visible presence of grace, as it is embodied in the world, and from there necessarily also in the Church and in Christian life. The task of theology is to understand how human life submits to the intimacy of God with us, the incessant incarnation in history. Thus, it will play its own, sacramental part in the history of a positive and creative force that undoubtedly will result in reforms and transformations that are directed toward the future of God.

Notes

1. Cf. Ted Schoof, *Aggiornamento: de doorbraak van een nieuwe katholieke theologie*, Baarn: Het Wereldvenster, 1968, pp. 13–20; ET Mark Schoof (trans.), *Breakthrough: The Beginnings of the New Catholic Theology,* Dublin: Gill and Macmillan, 1970.
2. A collection of his *Concilium* essays can be found in Edward Schillebeeckx, *The Language of Faith: Essays on Jesus, Theology, and the Church*, intro. Robert J. Schreiter, Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1995.
3. Cf. Lieven Boeve, Frederiek Depoortere, Stephan van Erp (eds), *Edward Schillebeeckx and Contemporary Theology*, New York & London: T&T Clark, 2010.
4. This was the topic of his valedictory lecture: Edward Schillebeeckx, *Theologisch geloofsverstaan anno 1983*, Baarn: Nelissen, 1983.
5. He unfolded his idea of the tasks of systematic theology in an article in the very first issue of his own journal *Tijdschrift voor Theologie*: Edward Schillebeeckx, 'De nieuwe wending in de huidige Dogmatiek', *Tijdschrift voor Theologie* 1 (1961), pp. 17–47.
6. Stephan van Erp, 'Incarnational Theology. Systematic Theology After Schillebeeckx', in Thomas Eggensperger, Ulrich Engel, Angel Mendez-Montoya (eds), *Edward Schillebeeckx. Impulse für Theologien – Impetus Towards Theologies*, Ostfildern: Grünewald Verlag, 2012, pp. 52–65.
7. The 'equals' sign in Schillebeeckx's diagram for the hermeneutics of revelation needs further study. Until now, the proportional relation between gospel and context has become common knowledge in liberal theology, but the continuity between these historical proportionalities has been neglected, not least by Schillebeeckx himself: Edward Schillebeeckx, *Church the Human Story of God*, New York: Crossroad, 1990, pp. 40–5 (diagram on p. 42).
8. Robert Schreiter, *The New Catholicity: Theology between the Global and the Local*, Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1997, pp. 127–33.
9. Lieven Boeve, *Interrupting Tradition: An Essay on Christian Faith in a Postmodern Context*, Leuven & Dudley, MA: Peeters Press/W. B. Eerdmans, 2003.
10. Erik Borgman, *Edward Schillebeeckx: A Theologian in His History* Part 1: *A Catholic Theology of Culture (1914–1965),* London & New York: Continuum, 2003, pp. 360–81: 'Postscript: Notes on the Theological Yield'; cf. also his '". . . like a sacrament": Towards a Theological View on the Real Existing Church', in Thomas Eggensperger, Ulrich Engel, Angel Mendez-Montoya (eds), *Edward Schillebeeckx: Impulse für Theologien,* pp. 330–51. Borgman presented an outline for his theological program in Dutch: . . . *want de plaats waarop je staat is heilige grond: God als onderzoeksgprogramma,* Amsterdam: Boom, 2008.

11. Edward Schillebeeckx, *Christ the Sacrament of the Encounter with God*, London: Sheed and Ward, 1963.
12. *Idem*, p. 203.
13. *Idem*, p. 200.
14. Edward Schillebeeckx, *Collected Works*, Volumes 1–11, Series Editors: Ted Schoof, Carl Sterkens with Erik Borgman and Robert Schreiter, New York & London: Continuum, 2012.